<u>REMARKS</u>

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on 04 June 2007.

In the present Amendment, the Applicant amends claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 14, 16-19 and 21; no claims have been added or canceled. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the claims as amended. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been entered; the amendment is fully supported by the application as originally filed.

The Applicant respectfully acknowledges that an Amendment After Final Action cannot be made as a matter of right. The amendments made to the claims, however, merely include previously-recited limitations of previous dependent claims, and therefore do not raise new issues or necessitate any new search. Also, the Examiner's argumentation for the rejection of claims has been based on many of the same references utilized in previous rejections. As apparent, the Amendment does not impose any substantial burden on the Examiner or USPTO. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the claims as amended, and allowance of the present application as amended.

In the Office Action of June 04, 2007, the Examiner maintained the allowability of claims 11-13. In response, the Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's continued indication of allowability of claims 11-13.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on US2002/0165012A1 to Kirbas et al., US2004/0198335A1 to Campen, and US2004/0184593A1 to Elsey et al. In response, the Applicant amends claims 1, 4-5, and 8-9 based on previous dependent claims, and submits that the claims as amended are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons.

For a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art in combination must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. In addition, there must be an adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art.

The present application is directed to restricting particular long distance telephone calls made from a wireless communication device with use of a host enterprise server. The host enterprise server is connected in a private communication network of an enterprise which is outside of a wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates. The wireless device is operative to regularly perform data synchronization, over a wireless link of a wireless communication network, for data items of a personal information manager application of the wireless device and corresponding data items stored at the host enterprise server. The wireless device is further operative to receive, over a wireless link of the wireless communication network, long distance call restriction information from the _same_ host enterprise server of the private

16

communication network. The long distance restriction information includes information indicative of one or more allowable/disallowable country codes or area codes. The long distance call restriction information is stored in a user profile which is unique to the individual and being one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise. The long distance call restrictions may be, for example, managed by an IT department of a corporation which has authority or control over the wireless device.

The present invention as defined by the amended independent claims discussed is advantageous over the prior art of record in that the *same* host enterprise server of the enterprise that is utilized to regularly perform data synchronization for data items of a personal information manager application (e.g. e-mail message data items or calendar data items) to also provide *private* control for restricting long distance calls from the wireless device. Such private control is separate from the governing wireless and telephony network, provided a flexible and convenient manner for enterprises such as companies and corporations, in a consolidated and centralized fashion.

With respect to claims 1-10 which have been rejected based primarily on the Kirbas et al., Campen, and Elsey et al. references, these claims have been amended to define the features as described above.

None of the prior art references teach or suggest a host enterprise server utilized to regularly perform data synchronization, over a wireless communication network, for data items (e.g. e-mail or calendar items) of a personal information manager application of the wireless device and corresponding data items stored at the host enterprise server. The host enterprise server of the present application is specifically one that is connected in a private communication network of an enterprise, and is

the same host enterprise server utilized to maintain and send long distance call restriction information to the wireless device for long distance call restriction.

The Examiner asserts in the Office Action of 04 June 2007 that Kirbas et al. teaches or suggests such data item synchronization. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Kirbas et al. in paragraph 3 at lines 10-14 and paragraphs 26-27 (port 190), no data synchronization between data items is performed over a wireless communication network. Further, the information that is described as being programmed in the device of Kirbas et al. is long distance information, not data items of a personal information manager application for data synchronization. Even further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kirbas et al. to perform data synchronization of long distance information.

One ordinarily skilled in the art will readily appreciate the meaning of *synchronization* or *data synchronization* between two devices via a wireless communication network. If the Examiner is broadly interpreting such terminology in any other manner, the Applicant respectfully submits that such interpretation would be <u>unreasonable</u>.

In addition, there is no adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the references as the Examiner has attempted to. The Kirbas et al. reference teaches long distance information, but only mentions in passing that "the instruction set and the database can be downloaded via the antenna 210 of the transceiver 140" (see Kirbas et al. in paragraph 26 at lines 5-8). Kirbas et al. otherwise mention little if anything regarding where the information may be obtained from, especially with respect to wireless network techniques. On the other hand, Campen does teach the control and programming of functional aspects of a wireless device, but makes no reference to long distance call

restriction information which includes one or more country codes or area codes. Note that limitations on "what phone numbers may be called and/or received" (compare paragraph 3 of Campen: "[a] personal digital assistant may block incoming electronic messages (emails) from a particular user") and limitations on call durations are not the same thing as long distance call restriction information which includes one or more country codes or area codes. Therefore, there is no strong or adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Campen with the teachings of Kirbas et al. as the Examiner asserts.

Even further, the Elsey et al. reference fail to teach or suggest limitations that would be properly combined with the teachings of Kirbas et al. and Campen. The "user profiles" that the Examiner identifies in Elsey et al. merely relate to profiles in servers of a telephone directory assistance system for public purposes, not for a host enterprise server connected in a private communication network of an enterprise which is outside of a wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates. Such profiles would not be maintained in any "private communication network of an enterprise of an individual [which utilizes the wireless device]," as directory assistance of only a limited nature would then be provided, which is undesirable (see e.g. paragraph 4 of Elsey et. al.: "[t]he problem with such a [concierge] service is that it is restricted to the guess at a specific hotel only"). In addition, the information in such "user profiles" has nothing to do with long distance call restrictions, but rather relates to directory assistance calls and history associated with such calls.

On the other hand, the Elsey et. al. reference does teach call authorization data which identifies any long distance calling limitations for a user, but such teaching carries with it at least two deficiencies. For one,

the call authorization data appears to be more public in nature, for accounts held by the customers of telephone services generally (i.e. not relating to "a private communication network of an enterprise of an individual [which utilizes the wireless device]"). Secondly, this information does not relate to long distance call restriction information involving one or more country codes or area codes. In Elsey et al., it is stated that:

> Based on the destination telephone number retrieved by the operator, the caller identification information received with the call by directory assistance system 100, and call authorization data stored on data servers 120a, the operating software on the data servers attempts to verify (step 422) the caller's authorization to connect to the destination telephone number through directory assistance system 100. For example, a caller may not be authorized to make long-distance telephone calls on his or her account. When such a caller connects to directory assistance system 100 from his or her home local calling area, the software simply determines whether the caller is trying to call a destination telephone number outside of the caller's local calling area. If, however, the caller is connected to directory assistance system 100 from a calling area outside of his or her home local calling area, the software uses the ANI received with the call, as well as the destination telephone number, to determine whether the caller is attempting to place a long-distance call.

As apparent, it is the currently-supplied ANI and the destination telephone number from the caller that are used to determine whether the caller is attempting to place a long-distance call, not one or more country codes or area codes that are stored in a user profile. Therefore, there is no strong or adequate suggestion or motivation to utilize "user profiles" of Elsey et al. as asserted by the Examiner in combination with the teachings of Kirbas et al. and Campen.

Since the prior art fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1-10 as amended, and there is no adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the references as asserted by the Examiner, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdrawn such rejections and allow the claims as amended.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kirbas et al. (US2002/0165012A1) in view of Smith (US2006/0210046A1) and in further view of Elsey (US2004/0184593). In response, the Applicant amends claims 14, 16, and 18 and respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

These claims are allowable for many of the same reasons as provided above with respect to Kirbas et al. and Elsey. Notably, the prior art alone and in combination fail to teach or suggest that a query request is made to the host enterprise server in the private network of the enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates. In Smith, the primary focus of the relevant network is in connection with a *telecommunications provider* (see e.g. Smith in paragraphs 5, 15, and 52. Although Kirbas et al. describe an administrator of an employer which may facilitate the programming of a wireless device, such programming does not relate to a query request received at a host enterprise server of a wireless network for area codes and country codes for long distance restriction. Finally, the query request of the present invention is performed in response to a telephone call attempt from the wireless device to a telephone number which is subject to the potential long distance call restriction. No query request of the prior art relates to any such triggering.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Boltz et al. (US6081731) in view of Smith (US2006/0210046A1). In response, the Applicant amends claims 17, 18, 19, and 21 and respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

These claims are allowable for many of the same reasons as indicated above. Notably, the prior art in combination, including Smith, does not teach or suggest a host enterprise server utilized to regularly perform data synchronization, over a wireless communication network, for data items (e.g. e-mail or calendar items) of a personal information manager application of the wireless device and corresponding data items stored at the host enterprise server. The host enterprise server of the present application is specifically one that is connected in a private communication network of an enterprise, and is the same host enterprise server utilized to restrict long distance calling based on a query and response protocol.

Data messaging services as taught in Smith are not the same as the data synchronization between data items of a personal information manager application and corresponding data items stored at the host enterprise server. See Smith in paragraph 57: "mobile-to-mobile text messaging allows a sender to create and transmit text messages *using the mobile number* of a recipient. E-mail messaging allows a sender to address e-mail messages *using the mobile number* of a recipient. Web messaging allows users to send personalized text messages from a public Web site..." (Emphasis Added).

Even further, Boltz do not teach or suggest the use of a host enterprise server of a private network of an enterprise (e.g. managed by

an IT department) for maintaining storage of long distance restriction information. Instead, Boltz teaches the use of a database in the SS7 signaling network (not a private network of an enterprise which includes the individual) or other public databases/networks. Thus, private control by the enterprise may not be easily obtained by Boltz. The Boltz reference does not even relate to area codes and country codes for long distance restriction, but rather to a Selective Carrier Denial feature.

Finally, the query request of the present invention is performed in response to a telephone call attempt from the wireless device to a telephone number which is subject to the potential long distance call restriction. No query request of the prior art relates to any such triggering.

Other arguments for patentability are apparent but considered moot in light of arguments already presented.

Again, the Applicant request entry of the Amendment and reconsideration of the claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that the application as amended is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Oskorep/

Date: 01 August 2007

JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 U.S.A.

Telephone: (312) 222-1860   Fax: (312) 475-1850